

REMARKS

This response (Amendment C) is provided after careful consideration of the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008 and the Advisory Action mailed June 23, 2008. Claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-26 remain in the application and claims 27 and 28 are added after entry of this response. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks provided herein.

The Office Action

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0223504 to Wybenga et al.

Claims 3 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over Wybenga in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,785,227 to Sundling et al.

Claims 6, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over Wybenga.

Claims 9, 10 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over Wybenga in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0078696 to Oner.

The Office Action

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15-17, 19, 20 and 23-26 Patentably Distinguish Over Wybenga.

As amended, independent claim 1 is directed to a "digital communication system" that includes "at least one node interconnected through a fabric" and including "a plurality of network processing devices, at least one network processing device for receiving at least one of the cell and the packet information," "a shared bus structure for coupling each of the network processing devices with each other," and "**an interface for coupling the at least one network processing device with the fabric to support**

communication between nodes via a coupling means different from the shared bus structure.

As pointed out by the Examiner, Wybenga includes nodes (see Fig. 1, 110, 120, 130, 140) interconnected through a fabric (see Fig. 1, 150) and including a plurality of network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250), a shared bus structure (see Fig. 2, 290) coupling the network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250) to each other, and an interface device (see Fig. 2, 280). However, **the interface device (see Fig. 2, 280) does not couple any of the network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250) to the fabric (see Fig. 1, 150) through any coupling means different from the shared bus structure (see Fig. 2, 290)** as recited in amended claim 1. Rather, the interface device (see Fig. 2, 280) couples the network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250) to the fabric (see Fig. 1, 150) through a PCI Bridge (see Fig. 2, 270) that interfaces with the shared bus structure (see Fig. 2, 290).

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the corresponding § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and claims dependent thereon (e.g., claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, and 16) are currently in condition for allowance.

Similarly, as amended, independent claim 17 is directed to a “communication node” that includes “a plurality of network processing devices, at least one network processing device for receiving at least one of the cell and the packet information,” “a shared bus structure for coupling each of the network processing device with each other,” and **“at least one of a System Interface and a Maintenance Interface coupled to the at least one network processing device via a coupling means different from the shared bus structure.”**

As pointed out by the Examiner, Wybenga includes a plurality of network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250), a shared bus structure (see Fig. 2, 290), a System Interface (see Fig. 2, 280), and a Maintenance Interface (see Fig. 2, MSI; Para. 41, doorbell interrupt). However, **the System Interface (see Fig. 2, 280) is not coupled to any of the network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250) via a coupling means different from the shared bus structure (see Fig. 2, 290)** as recited in amended claim 17. Rather, the System Interface (see Fig. 2, 280) is coupled to the

network processing devices (see Fig. 2, 230, 240, 250) through a PCI Bridge (see Fig. 2, 270) that interfaces with the shared bus structure (see Fig. 2, 290).

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the corresponding § 102(e) rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that independent claim 17 and claims dependent thereon (e.g., claims 19, 20, and 23-26) are currently in condition for allowance.

Claims 3 and 18 Patentably Distinguish Over the Combination of Wybenga and Sundling.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentably distinct from the combination of Wybenga and Sundling for at least the same reasons provided above distinguishing claim 1 from Wybenga. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that claim 3 is currently in condition for allowance.

Similarly, claim 18 depends from claim 17. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentably distinct from the combination of Wybenga and Sundling for at least the same reasons provided above distinguishing claim 17 from Wybenga. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that claim 18 is currently in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 14, and 21 Patentably Distinguish Over Wybenga on Obviousness Grounds.

Claim 6 and 14 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 6 and 14 are patentably distinct from Wybenga on obviousness grounds for at least the same reasons provided above distinguishing claim 1 from Wybenga. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that claims 6 and 14 are currently in condition for allowance.

Similarly, claim 21 depends from claim 17. Accordingly, claim 21 is patentably distinct from the combination of Wybenga on obviousness grounds for at least the same reasons provided above distinguishing claim 17 from Wybenga. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that claim 21 is currently in condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 22 Patentably Distinguish Over the Combination of Wybenga and Oner.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentably distinct from the combination of Wybenga and Oner for at least the same reasons provided above distinguishing claim 1 from Wybenga. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that claim 9 is currently in condition for allowance.

Similarly, claim 22 depends from claim 17. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentably distinct from the combination of Wybenga and Oner for at least the same reasons provided above distinguishing claim 17 from Wybenga. Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicants submit that claim 22 is currently in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION


For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-28) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to telephone Alan C. Brandt, at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP

August 19, 2008
Date


Alan C. Brandt, Reg. No. 50,218
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any item referred to herein as being attached or enclosed) is (are) being transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.	
Date: August 19, 2008	Signature: 